

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Proposition 1E Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Grant Program *Stormwater Flood Management Grant, Round 2, 2013*

Applicant	Santa Clara Valley Water District	Amount Requested	\$ 30,000,000
------------------	-----------------------------------	-------------------------	---------------

Proposal Title	Berryessa Creek Flood Protection Proposal	Total Proposal Cost	\$ 81,865,630
-----------------------	---	----------------------------	---------------

PROJECT SUMMARY

The primary goal of the project is to provide 100-year flood protection to the 22 square-mile watershed that includes the City of Milpitas and portions of the City of San Jose. Other goals include water quality improvements through sedimentation and erosion reduction; habitat protection and restoration, improved maintenance of Berryessa Creek and tributaries, and expanded recreation opportunities. The Project consists of three components: 1) Lower Berryessa improvements; 2) Lower Penitencia improvements; and 3) Upper Berryessa improvements. The downstream reaches (Components 1 and 2) must be constructed first in order to accommodate increased flows expected from the Upper Berryessa improvements (Component 3).

PROPOSAL SCORE

Criteria	Score/ Max. Possible	Criteria	Score/ Max. Possible
Work Plan	12/15	Technical Justification	6/10
Budget	2/5		
Schedule	4/5	Benefits and Cost Analysis	27/30
Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures	3/5	Program Preferences	7/10
Total Score (max. possible = 80)			61

EVALUATION SUMMARY

WORK PLAN

The criterion is less than fully addressed, and documentation and rationales are incomplete and insufficient. For example, the applicant presents adequate documentation for the project goals; however, there is insufficient detail to

determine if these goals would be realized. There is concern that the entire project is depending on the feasibility study for Component 3 which is scheduled for completion by July 2013. Work on Component 1 is scheduled to start in August 2013. If the final feasibility study suggests a different alternative than the draft feasibility study, the project implementation may become uncertain in terms of budget and schedule.

Also, a number of tasks in the work plan (4.1, 5.1, 6.1, 7.1, 7.3, 8.1, and 9.1) have components that will be claimed as cost-share and are described under the current status category for the task as completed. The components are also included under the proposed work category. However, because the applicant will be claiming these tasks as cost-share the work needs to be tied to the sub-task and deliverables need to be included. Additionally, the number of homes claimed to be protected by the project is inconsistent throughout the proposal (2,400, 2,463, and 3,400 are mentioned in application, BMS checklist, and work plan page 3-3, respectively).

BUDGET

The budget does not have detailed cost information as described in Attachment 4. Many of the costs cannot be verified as reasonable, and supporting documentation is lacking. For example, under Task 9 (Construction Contracting), the applicant does not include an explanation of how the costs were estimated; nor do they include an explanation for the estimated costs for Task 10.1 (Mobilization and Site Preparation) for both Components 2 and 3. No explanation was found to support the estimated costs provided for Task 10.2 – Project Construction - Component 2 (a \$4.1M task). Further, the total construction cost indicated in this document is \$4,020,000, but Table 4-6 (pg. 4-7) includes a \$4,530,000 budget cost for this line item (Task 10).

SCHEDULE

The schedule is generally consistent with the work plan and budget, reasonable, and demonstrates a readiness to begin construction no later than October 2014. However, because the entire project schedule depends on the feasibility study for Component 3, scheduled for completion by July 2013, the actual construction start date is less certain. In addition, for many tasks that have already commenced, or will be completed prior to grant award, the applicant does not include the actual duration or start date, but merely indicates a “start/finish” date of August 15, 2013, and indicates just 1 day duration. Examples include Task 4.1 and 4.2 (Easement Work for Components 1 and 2); Task 5.3 (Planning Work for Component 3); and Task 6.1 (Design for Component 1).

MONITORING, ASSESSMENT, AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation and rationales are incomplete or insufficient. Other than the first benefit claimed (flood protection), the other benefits claimed (e.g., reduction in turbidity, improved water quality, reduction in trash) are not quantified. The measurement parameters provided do not include quantified targets for the benefit claimed, as described in the PSP. For most project goals, only qualified targets are indicated, such as “Improved water quality” or “Reduced erosion and sedimentation.”

TECHNICAL JUSTIFICATION

The proposal appears to be technically justified to achieve the claimed benefits but lacks documentation that demonstrates the technical adequacy of the project. Although the applicant addresses the project benefits, the work plan does not present sufficient detail to determine if these benefits would be achieved. For example, on page 7-28 the statement “The project would improve water quality by reducing sedimentation and erosion”; however, no measurable

water quality benefits would be provided. The same applies for environmental benefits on page 7-29. Also, the maps provided only show up to 4 miles of trail instead of 6 miles (2 miles on each side of the creek), and it is unclear where the remaining 2 miles will be located.

BENEFITS AND COST ANALYSIS

Collectively the proposal is likely to provide a high level of benefits in relationship to cost and this finding is supported by detailed, high quality analysis and clear and complete documentation. However, a few numerical inconsistencies have been found between two tables. Total net present value (NPV) of costs is \$71.466 million compared to NPV of FDR benefits of \$172.6 million. The Flood Damage Reduction (FDR) analysis is based on the existing 2012 Berryessa Creek Evaluation Report completed in accordance with USACE standards in May 2012. Monetized recreation benefits are included, and non-monetized benefits are adequately documented.

PROGRAM PREFERENCES

Applicant demonstrates a high degree of certainty that the proposal will achieve 3 program preferences and 4 statewide priorities, and documents the magnitude and breadth of them. The proposal claims to achieve the following: 1) Include regional projects or programs; 2) Contribute to attainment of one or more of the objectives of the CALFED Bay-Delta Program; 3) Effectively integrate water management with land use planning; 4) Climate Change Response Actions; 5) Expand Environmental Stewardship; 6) Practice Integrated Flood Management; and 7) Protect Surface Water and Ground Quality.